

Docket No.: 42390.P13390

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Taylor et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,043,983 to Taylor et al.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the patent to Taylor does not disclose "*a printed circuit board having a ground ring connected to a ground plane of the printed circuit board*" as claimed in independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6. As shown in FIG. 4 of the Applicant's disclosure and as described in the disclosure on page 6, lines 1-3:

In one embodiment, a top perimeter ground ring 442 surrounds a perimeter of the top surface of the PCB 420, and the top portion of the metal casing 440a makes electrical contact with the perimeter ground ring 442. (Emphasis added)

Such a ground ring is not shown in the patent to Taylor. In fact, an electronic text search of the patent to Taylor as downloaded from the US Patent and Trademark Office's website was performed, and the word "ring" was not found. The Examiner is kindly reminded that:

The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as in the . . . claim. MPEP § 2131.01

Since the patent to Taylor does not show a ground ring as recited in the Applicant's claims, Taylor does not disclose an invention that is identical to the invention as recited in the Applicant's claims. It should be noted that in the rejection the Examiner called out to elements in Taylor by the corresponding reference numerals, however the Examiner did not call out any reference numeral that corresponds to the Applicant's ground ring. This is because such a ground ring simply does not exist in Taylor, so the rejection should be withdrawn. The Examiner is kindly requested to point specifically to such a

Docket No.: 42390.P13390
Appl. No.: 10/033,688

9

Docket No.: 42390.P13390

ground ring in Taylor, including the reference numeral for the ground ring, or to withdraw the rejection.

Pressler et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,550,713 to Pressler et al.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the patent to Pressler does not disclose a "top surface having a first perimeter ground ring" and a "bottom surface having a second perimeter ground ring" as recited in independent claim 7 and its dependent claims 8-12. In the rejection, the Examiner stated that Pressler discloses a "first perimeter ground ring 60" and a "second perimeter ground ring 60". The Examiner did not explain how a single element, the ground trace 60 of Pressman, can be two elements, the first and the second ground rings as recited in Applicant's claims. Furthermore, Pressler does not show a first perimeter ground ring disposed on a top surface of a printed circuit board and a second perimeter ground ring disposed on a bottom surface of the printed circuit board. The Examiner is kindly reminded that:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131.01 (Emphasis added)

Thus, since the patent to Pressler does not disclose each and every element of the Applicant's claim 7, as described above, claim 7 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Pressler, so the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 8, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Pressler does not disclose a plurality of vias 66 to "electrically couple the first perimeter ground ring to the second perimeter ground ring". As disclosed in Pressler at col. 4, lines 51-53:

The ground traces 56, 58, 60, 62 connect to the ground plates through a plurality of conductive vias.

Thus, Pressler does not disclose an identical invention as recited in the Applicant's claims, so Pressler does not anticipate the Applicant's claims, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Docket No.: 42390.P13390
Appl. No.: 10/033,688

10

Docket No.: 42390.P13390

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Taylor et al. in view of Krehbiel et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,043,983 of Taylor et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,206,728 to Krehbiel et al.

As discussed with respect to the § 102 rejection, above, the patent to Taylor does not disclose "*a printed circuit board having a ground ring connected to a ground plane of the printed circuit board*" as claimed in independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6. The Examiner is kindly reminded that, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness:

The prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP §§ 2142, 2143

Since neither Taylor nor Krehbiel discloses such a ground ring, a *prima facie* case of obviousness was not established, so the rejection should be withdrawn.

Taylor et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 5-12, 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,043,983 to Taylor et al.

As discussed with respect to the § 102 rejection, above, the patent to Taylor does not disclose "*a printed circuit board having a ground ring connected to a ground plane of the printed circuit board*" as claimed in independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6. Since Taylor does not disclose such a ground ring, a *prima facie* case of obviousness was not established, so the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 5 specifically, even if it were known to use double-sided printed circuit boards as asserted by the Examiner, such information is still insufficient to establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because such information does not teach or suggest providing a printed circuit board having a ground ring connected to a ground plane of the printed circuit board. Furthermore, such information does not establish any

Docket No.: 42390.P13390
Appl. No.: 10/033,688

Docket No.: 42390.P13390

motivation to provide a first metal casing to make electrical contact with a first perimeter ground ring on the top surface of a printed circuit board (as recited in claim 5 through intervening claims 2 and 4), and a second perimeter ground ring on the bottom surface of the printed circuit board (as recited in claim 5). Neither the patent to Taylor nor the Examiner's description of what was known teach or suggest such elements nor such an arrangement of the elements. Thus, the Examiner did not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 5, so the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, the Applicant hereby traverses the Examiner's assertion of what was known in the art in support of the rejection, and hereby kindly requests the Examiner to either provide a reference in support of the assertion, or to set forth facts supporting the assertion in an Examiner's affidavit, or to otherwise withdraw the rejection. See MPEP 2144.03; 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2).

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner stated that "the first perimeter ground ring would be coupled to the second perimeter ground ring by a plurality of vias spaced around the first and second perimeter rings." However, as stated above, neither Taylor nor the Examiner's assertion of what was known in the art teaches such first and second perimeter ground rings, let alone a plurality of vias to couple the first and second ground rings.

Regarding claims 7-10 and 18-19, the Examiner did not provide any additional information beyond the rejection of claim 5 which has already been addressed herein.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, although Taylor shows covers 20 and 22, the patent to Taylor does not disclose a ground ring as discussed, above.

Docket No.: 42390.P13390
Appl. No.: 10/033,688

12

Docket No.: 42390.P13390

Conclusion


In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney, Kenneth J. Cool, at (408) 850-1229 if there remains any issue with allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
INTEL CORPORATION

Date: 12/29/03


Kenneth J. Cool
Reg. No. 40,570
Senior Patent Attorney, Intel Corporation
Tel. (408) 850-1229

Kenneth J. Cool
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
Tel: (408) 850-1229
Fax: (720) 384-0753

Docket No.: 42390.P13390
Appl. No.: 10/033,688

13